

Norwich March 5, 1821.

Sir

My worthy friend Doctor Kovack, some time since, forwarded to me your very acceptable dried plants, with your letter so flattering to me. I should gladly have returned my thanks before now, but many things have prevented me. I am determined, however, not to procrastinate any longer, & as the best return I can make, I shall, with my best thanks, give a detail of all I have been able to discover concerning the plants about which you are in doubt. I must take them without any order, distinguished by your names. Indeed I propose to notice every one of your spec^{ies}, whether doubtful or not.

"*Lobelia Claytoniana*." Pursh 447. Sent formerly by Dr. Muhlenberg, under the name of *L. pallida*. Linnaeus had it from Kalm, & very erroneously confounded it with his own *L. Cliffortiana*.

"*Uralsia aristulata*" — quite new to me.

"*Sagittaria hastata* Pursh." — I have this from Muhlenberg, & the same in the Linn.^{ean} herbarium from China. I think it, as you suspect, a variety of *S. sagittifolia*, a plant found all over the world. The lobes of the leaves in yours scarcely spread so much as Pursh indicates.

"*Ctesium paniculatum* Michx." — *Hydroglossum palmatum* of Willd.^{ow}. & Pursh. Very good & acceptable. I had it not before. Perhaps this is the *Filix scandens* mentioned in Bartram's Travels, Chap. 4. p. 41.

"*Corylus rostrata*." Good. Linn.^{ean} had it from Kalm, & marked it *C. Avellana*!

"*Hydrocotyle Americana*." Exactly that of Herb. Linn.

"*Eriocaulon pellucidum*." — So I have thought it, though I have it from a friend as *flavidulum* to which it does not answer.

"*Ammannia*." — Seems indeed diff^{erent} from what Dr. Baldwin has sent me as *humilis*. It is more like *ramosior* of Herb. Linn. but smaller. I must rely on you for the excell^{ent} mark of the insertion of the petals.

"*Potentilla pensylvanica*." — not so, nor at all like it. More like our *rupestris*, but very distinct. *P. pensylvanica* is more

like recta in shape of leaflets, & serratures, but pinnate, & very softly downy. I have not your plant at all. —

"Xylosteum Solonis." — seems most near X. ciliatum of Pursh.

"Polygonum mite Pers. & Pursh." — new to me. —

"Carex virescens." — Extremely acceptable. There is in Herb. Linn. a specimen from Germany, pinned to C. globularis (which it scarcely can be) very near this plant of yours in the capsule, but not the same. —

"C. pedunculata." — new to me, & very acceptable. Pursh has

"spicis ramosissimis" for remotissimis!! —

"C. subulata Michx." also new to me. —

"C. broad leaved, w.^{ch} grows in Cedar swamps, is folliculata of Herb. Linn. found by Kalm. Pursh speaks of folliculata as very common. —

"Leersia virginica." — New to me. —

"Agrostis diffusa Muhl^r." appears to be, as the author says, not distinct from his own tenniflora, which I have. —

"Festuca polystachya Michx, procumbens Muhl." "I have nothing like it." —

"Eratista neglecta" is precisely the authentic E. virginiana from Kalm. The synonym of Hort. Malab. belongs to a different plant, considered by Vahl as a var.[?] of E. trifida, but I think it still more unlike that species. —

"Apocynum cannabinum" — not so, but androsamidifolium. —

"Arum virginicum" — right by Kalm's specimen. —

"Heliosis laevis" — exists in the Linn.^s herbarium under the names of Buphthalm. helianthoides, Helianthus laevis, Rudbeckia oppositifolia, and Silphium solidaginoides, as quoted by Pursh; so that this species is a botanical quaternity in Linnaeus. In excuse for him, I must remark, that 2 of the specimens are very bad, sent him dried, by different people, & look very diff.^t from the others. —

"Carex disperma" — is very near C. loliacea of Linn.^s & perhaps a variety, or starved plant. The fruit is almost precisely the same, but fewer together in your spec.^{ms} —

"Osmunda spectabilis Willd.^{ow}" — I really think this is not

distinct from ours, in spite of what Willdenow says.
"*Poa near viridis*." I had this formerly from Muhlenberg,
but could not find any thing like it, nor did he send
me any name with it.

"*Poa reptans* Mich.^x" very near *Poa Eragrostis* β of Willdenow,
w.^{ch} is a most distinct species from real *Eragrostis*, and
not, as Willd.^w says, a younger plant merely. I call it
elegantissima. Yours is exactly like it in size & habit,
but the spikes of *elegantissima* are purple, and the glumes
less ribbed, or less angular.

"*Cerastium tenuifolium* Pursh." I think arvense. Observe
the deflexed hairs on the stem. Muhlenberg sent me
a very distinct species, w.^{ch} I suppose is his ~~longe~~
longe: pedunculatum, a most intolerable name! He
might have called it *C. pedunculare*.

"*Lonicera villosa*." You give "the Pres.^t of the Linn. Soc."
much more credit than he deserves; for he is forced
to plead *ignoramus* to this plant, nor does Linnaeus
himself afford any light upon it.

"*Prunus pennsylvanica*." Right, & very acceptable, the
original specimen from the Upsal garden, described
by the elder Linnaeus in the *Supplementum Plantarum*,
being nearly destroyed by vermin before I had it. Now
my whole collection is preserved by a solution of
corrosive sublimate.

"*Andromeda ligustrina*, Muhl.^r" right certainly *Vaccinium*
ligustrinum of Linn.^s who never saw the fruit; but it is
not his *Androm.^a paniculata*, in w.^{ch} last point your N. York
Cat.^g is correct.

"*Epipactis convallarioides*" by no means ^{of Swartz.} Your plant does
not seem to me differ. from *E. cordata*, found on our
northern moors. I have it from both sides of North Amer.^a
It is however, apparently, *Ophrys cordata* of Michaux.

"*Euphorbia depressa*" of your Catalogue, is certainly the true *maculata*, agreeing precisely with the original spec.ⁿ in Herb. Linn. & with *Wikenet's* synonym.

"*E. maculata*" of your Catalogue is as certainly *hypericifolia*. The original spec.ⁿ is smooth, like yours, but there is a downy var.ⁿ from Jamaica, from Browne's herbarium. Linn.^s seems subsequently to have confounded his original smooth spec.ⁿ of *hypericifolia*, (numbered 17, as in Sp. Pl. ed. 1.) with *maculata*; not that they are at all alike, nor is there any foundation for his remark in the 2.^d Mantissa, p. 392. The 1.st ed.ⁿ of Sp. Pl. is here decisive authority. I have also the *hypericifolia*, smooth like yours, from the East Indies, wild.

"*Viola blanda*," I agree with you.

"*V. striata*, Michx." I have this for *debilis* of Michx.

"*Mitella cordifolia*." Is, I think, not at all different from *M. nuda* Herb. Linn. from Siberia, w.^{ch} is a synonym of Pursh's *reniformis*. Lamarck's figure confirms my opinion.

"*Ranunculus pusillus*" seems my *flagelliformis* in Rees's Cyclopaedia (n. 13), with more oblong leaves.

"*Nedytis pumila*" A new species, near *trinervis* and *hirsuta*. I must beg to refer you to my articles *Nedytis* & *Oldenlandia* in Rees's Cyclopaedia, where I have endeavoured to settle these genera & their species.

For "*Windsoria pallida*" I thank you — but surely *trinaloa*!

"*Ammi capillaceum*, Michx." new to me.

"*Xanthium maculatum* Raf.^{que}" I think it *X. orientale*, w.^{ch}, unluckily for its name, is an American plant. Are you acquainted with this *M. Rafinesque*?

"*Alisma parviflora* Pursh." I think a good species, the flowers being so very much smaller than *A. Plantago*.

